No. 292 & 9.

Motion to remit Costs.

Filed Dec. 6, 1897.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

8-9-0-7
S. C.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES

MOTION BY APPELLANTS TO REMIT CLERK'S COSTS FOR SUPERVISING PRINTING.

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALIAFERRO A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
WM. G. JOHNSON,
For Appellants uniting in the Motion.

8983 LAW REPORTER PRINT

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES

Come now the undersigned appellants, by their respective counsel, and move the court to remit the clerk's costs for supervising printing of the record, amounting to $2,600.00, and in support thereof show as follows:

That this is a proceeding provided for by a special Act of Congress. That by stipulation found in the printed record, Volume 7, pages 2395, 2396, the United States has agreed through Richard Olney, Attorney General, that the United States, complainant herein in the court below, and appellee in this court, would furnish the requisite transcript of Record for appeal by the defendants, or any of them, and the necessary printed copies thereof, for the hearing of this Honorable Court, without cost to the appellants.

That all the proceedings in the court below were printed by the United States, and that the transcript filed in this cause is one of the printed copies used below, consisting of seven printed volumes, containing 2,735 pages, duly certified

by the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and the necessary copies of the Record are mechanical reproductions of this transcript, except for the original signature and seal of the clerk.

And in further support of their motion they show:

I.

That no supervising or preparation for the printer by the clerk is necessary, or has in fact been done.

II.

That the bill of complaint herein is in fact multifarious and could not be maintained, except under the authority of the special act of Congress, no defendant being concerned in all the Record, and most of them in very little of it.

III.

That if appellants prevail, they cannot under the rules of this court, recover any part of this $2,600.00 clerk's costs, although by law that sum would go, not to the clerk, but to the United States, the appellee in this cause.

IV.

That this suit is, by the provisions of the special act of Congress, in one aspect of it, a condemnation proceeding, in which costs could not be charged against owners of land sought to be taken.

V.

Finally, it is submitted that not only by the fair intent and meaning of the stipulation before mentioned, but also under the proper construction of the act of Congress itself, the appellants are exonerated and exempted from any duty to

pay any costs in and about the printing of the Record in in this cause.

The undersigned also represent that the counsel for the United States have been duly notified of this application and make no objection thereto; and that the undersigned are the only counsel who have thus far entered appearance in this court for any of the appellants.

Wherefore, and by reason of the premises, the undersigned respectfully request the court to grant their aforesaid motion to remit the costs of supervising printing asked for by the clerk.

Nov. 29, 1897.

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
Counsel for—

Wm. G. Johnson, assignee of American Ice Co.; Avarilla Lambert, Martina Carr, heirs of John Van Riswick, deceased; Great Falls Ice Co.; Annie E. Barbour, Harrison S. Barbour, Jas. F. Barbour, Mary V. McCartney, Annie E. Irwin, Annie M. Barbour, Regina Rengifo and George D. Barbour, widow and heirs of James L. Barbour; Thomas W. Riley; Mary S. Kimmell Gray, Wm. L. Kimmell, Frank Kimmell, Lester Kimmell, Mary G. Kimmell, Rex Kimmell, Louise M. Kimmell, Eunice Kimmell and Frances E. Kimmell, children, and Gertrude C. Kimmell Wing, widow, heirs of Mary A. S. Kimmell; J. Harrison Johnson and Annie E. Johnson, Charles B. Church and William Wimsatt.

CALDERON CARLISLE.
WM. G. JOHNSON.
Counsel for E. M. Willis.

No. 292. 49.

Motion to Postpone.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 6 1897
JAMES H. McKENNEY
CLERK

Filed Dec. 6, 1897.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES.

MOTION BY APPELLANTS TO POSTPONE HEARING OF CAUSE AND TO FIX THE TIME TO BE ALLOWED AND THE NUMBER OF COUNSEL TO BE HEARD IN ORAL ARGUMENT.

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
WM. G. JOHNSON,
For Appellants uniting in Motion.

5780 LAW REPORTER PRINT

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES.

Come now the undersigned appellants, by their respective counsel, and move the court—

First: To postpone the hearing of this cause until some day suited to the convenience of the court after the February recess of this term.

Second: To make, before or at the time of fixing a day for the hearing of this cause, some proper order as to the time to be allowed for the oral arguments and the number of Counsel to be heard.

And they respectfully show in support of the first branch of this motion, for the postponement of said cause, that Hierome O. Claughton, counsel for certain defendants, being the heirs of and claiming under Chief Justice John Marshall, died in August last, and that R. Byrd Lewis, counsel for the heirs of James M. Marshall, a brother of said John, died in October last, and that———Scott, another of the counsel for the heirs of said John Marshall, has died since the taking of the appeal in the cause, and that the cases of the heirs of the said James and John Marshall, respectively, are in some of their features in conflict; the grant of the Crown to Lord

Culpepper of the Northern Neck of Virginia is relied upon by the heirs of said John as a source of title, while the heirs of said James, although relying upon the same grant, also set up title under the grant of the province of Maryland to Lord Baltimore under certain deeds in which the heirs of said John Marshall have no apparent interest; and that it will be impracticable for the said parties to secure new counsel, and for such new counsel properly to prepare their cases for presentation to this court by the time fixed for the hearing of said cause in January by the present order of this court.

In support of the second branch of the motion, as to the time to be allowed for oral argument, and the number of counsel to be heard, they show that, as appears by the bill of complaint in this case (Record, Vol. 1, p. 13) and the Act of Congress authorizing this proceeding (Stat. at L., Vol. 24, p. 335) the purpose of this suit is to establish and make clear the title of the United States, and, if none be established, to ascertain, for the purpose of condemnation, the value of a vast area of land now held and claimed by a large number of persons and corporations under varying claims of title. The proceeding is against more than one hundred defendants. Over forty separate answers of parties claiming divers interests have been filed, and upwards of twenty-four appeals have been taken.

The most ample jurisdiction is conferred by Congress upon the court below, and upon this court, to hear, try and determine the matter in controversy, and every part thereof, and the decision of the court is declared to be final and conclusive against every party to the cause, and every one who, by publication, was cited to appear therein.

By the 5th Section of the Act of Congress it is expressly provided that an appeal to this court shall be allowed to the United States and to any other party in the cause, complaining of such decree. It was undoubtedly the purpose of Congress, while providing for the assembling of all the par-

ties, with their conflicting claims and interests, in the one suit, to give to every party an equal right to be heard in this court, as well as in the court below, with respect to his claims.

In the court below, although, by agreement, no counsel made oral arguments in behalf of the parties claiming from the Long Bridge to the Arsenal, the arguments in behalf of the other parties to the cause consumed twenty court days of the average duration of five hours each.

Counsel, realizing that it is their duty to save the valuable time of this court, and that it is undesirable and unnecessary, notwithstanding the just and liberal provision of the Act of Congress, for this court to hear oral argument in behalf of each of the parties appellant, bring to the attention of the court the fact that the claims and contentions of many of the parties defendant are of similar character, and are supported or assailed by similar evidence, and may be properly and conveniently grouped and heard together. But it is submitted that justice requires that at least six classes of appellants concerned, with distinct claims and questions, should be recognized by this court, as follows:

I. The claims under the Kidwell Patent, which the United States is seeking to set aside.

II. The claims of the heirs of Chief Justice Marshall, and of his brother, James M. Marshall, affecting the title to the whole of the Potomac River and its shores adjacent to the city of Washington.

III. Certain claims to lands above the Long Bridge in conflict with the United States and the claims under the Kidwell Patent and the claims of the Marshall heirs.

IV. The claims in succession of title and possession of the lands formerly occupied by Notley Young's mansion, garden and graveyard, excepting only the streets.

V. The claims in succession of title and possession from Notley Young of land submerged at the time of the laying out of the city, and which after a hundred years continuous

possession is still undisturbed by the interposition of any street.

VI. The claims of riparian rights and privileges of wharfing, notwithstanding the interposition of Water street.

Counsel further represent that the dissimilar character of the cases of some of the appellants, the unfamiliarity of the counsel representing parties in one class with the cases of the parties in other classes, and the conflict of claims between various defendants, renders it impossible to condense this case into a smaller number of classes requiring separate oral presentation than that here indicated.

And the undersigned respectfully submit that the several counsel representing the numerous parties defendant in this cause, comprised in the six classes just mentioned, should agree among themselves as to the counsel to be heard in their behalf in this court, so that it will not be necessary to hear argument from more than two counsel in behalf of each class, in addition to the counsel for the United States.

That the case is a special proceeding and could not possibly be maintained as one case in any court, except under the express authority of a statute, and because of the magnitude of the case and large number of conflicting interests involved, conflicting not only with the claims of the United States, but in some instances as between codefendants, it would be impossible to present the entire controversy as one case.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that there be allowed two hours for counsel for the appellants in each class, and two hours to the counsel for the United States, appellee in each class.

Counsel further represent that the foregoing arrangement would, in their judgment, secure to the parties in interest the proper opportunity for the presentation of their respective claims, and in suggesting the same counsel have faithfully regarded their duty to this court, the limitations upon its time, and the pressing public business before it.

The undersigned are advised that the counsel for the

United States have no objection to the foregoing motion and suggestion.

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
Solicitors for the following Appellants:
Wm. G. Johnson, assignee of American Ice Co.; Avarilla Lambert, Martina Carr, heirs of John Van Riswick, deceased; Great Falls Ice Co.; Annie E. Barbour, Harrison S. Barbour, Jas. F. Barbour, Mary V. McCartney, Annie E. Irwin, Annie M. Barbour, Regina Rengifo, and George D. Barbour, widow and heirs of James L. Barbour; Thomas W. Riley; Mary S. Kimmell Gray, Wm. L. Kimmell, Frank Kimmell, Lester Kimmell, Mary G. Kimmell, Rex Kimmell, Louise M. Kimmell, Eunice Kimmell and Frances E. Kimmell, children, and Gertrude C. Kimmell Wing, widow of Andrew Jackson Kimmell, deceased, heirs of Mary A. S. Kimmell; J. Harrison Johnson and Annie E. Johnson, Charles B. Church and William Wimsatt.

CALDERON CARLISLE,
WM. G. JOHNSON,
Solicitors for E. M. Willis.

To—

Honorable Holmes Conrad and Hugh T. Taggart, special counsel for the United States, appellee in the above entitled cause;

Messrs. George E. Hamilton and Nathaniel Wilson, counsel for Martin F. Morris, and others, appellants;

John Selden, Esquire, counsel for the Washington Steam-

boat Company, Limited, and Moncure Robinson and others, appellants;

Messrs. J. K. Cowen, H. L. Bond, Jr., and C. F. T. Beale, counsel for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and Cowen, Bond and Bryan, trustees, appellants;

Joseph J. Darlington, Esquire, counsel for the Independent Ice Company, appellant;

Messrs. Enoch Totten and E. A. Newman, counsel for William W. Rapley, appellant;

William F. Mattingly, Esquire, counsel for Daniel S. Evans, appellant;

Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, counsel for Richard J. Beall, appellant;

Messrs. William A. and J. Holdsworth Gordon and Enoch Totten, counsel for William L. Dunlop and others, heirs of Robert Peter, appellants;

Honorable A. Leo Knott, counsel for Henry M. Marshall and others, heirs of James Marshall, appellants;

Messrs. Mackall and Maedel, counsel for Elizabeth K. Riley, appellant;

James S. Brooke, Esquire, counsel for heirs of Chief Justice Marshall, appellants;

Messrs. Webb, Webb and Lindsley and Lambert and Lambert, counsel for heirs of William Easby, appellants;

Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, counsel for Margaret J. Stone and others, heirs of James Beall, of James, appellants;

Messrs. Webb, Webb and Lindsley and Lambert and Lambert, counsel for heirs of John B. Easby, appellants.

Please take notice that the annexed and foregoing motion will be brought to the attention of the court on Monday, the 13th of December, at 12 o'clock, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard.

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
WILLIAM G. JOHNSON,
Counsel for the Appellants uniting in this Motion.

No. 292.

49.

MARTIN F. MORRIS & AL.,
vs.
THE UNITED STATES.

ffice Supreme Court U.
FILED.
DEC 11 189
JAMES H. McKENNEY,
CLER

Notice having been filed by sundry appellants, (by counsel) of a motion to be snbmitted to this Hon. Court on the 13th December, 1897, for a postponement of the hearing of this cause, until some day after the February recess of this term.

The undersigned, counsel on behalf of the heirs at law of Chief Justice Marshall, respectfully shows to the Court, that such postponement is, in his judgment, necessary to the ends of justice for the following reasons:

The said heirs have, until recently, been represented by Hon. H. O. Claughton of the District Bar and by Messrs. Brooke & Scott, of the Virginia Bar. The first named gentleman, gave special attention to the preparation of the cause and conducted the oral argument in the Court below. The official duties of Mr. Scott, as Attorney-General of Virginia, necessarily prevented such attention to the details of the cause as he would otherwise have given to it. He departed this life in August last, and more recently Mr. Claughton was called suddenly hence, by a distressing accident. He was expected to take a leading part in the argument of the cause in this Court and had been actively engaged in preparing for it.

These deaths, and the difficulty of communicating with the heirs, who are widely scattered, have prevented any arrangement so far, for the supplying counsel in place of those who have died. This will be done as soon as possible. But some time must be required to enable the new counsel to acquaint themselves with the contents of the voluminous Record and the intricate questions involved.

Under existing circumstances the sole surviving counsel does not find it within his power to perform alone, the onerous duty of counsel, without the allowance of further time.

He therefore unites in the motion for a postponement of the hearing.

As to the time to be allowed for argument, it is respectfully suggested that so far as the issue between the Government and the "*Marshall heirs*" is concerned, the allowance of two hours would be scarcely adequate to the prop-

vs.

THE UNITED STATES.

For such use as may
be required by the Rules of the
Court; as to which I am Solicitor
Gen'l.
L. V. B.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES.

Come now the undersigned appellants by their respective counsel and ask leave to unite in the motion herein filed by Reginald Fendall, Tallmadge A. Lambert, Calderon Carlisle and Wm. G. Johnson, as solicitors for certain appellants, with the following addition or amendment however, to wit: That there be added to the classes mentioned on page 3 of said motion as printed and filed this following class:

> "III A. The claim of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company to riparian rights and accretions to its property between Easby's Point and Seventeenth street,"

thus making seven instead of six classes of claims as set forth in said motion. And they respectfully show in support of this motion that the said Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company by John K. Cowen, Joseph Bryan and Hugh L. Bond, Jr., trustees, claim the accretions and riparian rights between Easby's Point and Seventeenth street by virtue of charter grant from the United States and the acquisition of all the property and rights of the original owners of the

shore, and that consequently the claims of said Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company are antagonistic to the claims of all the other appellants claiming as owners between Easby's Point and Seventeenth street.

That such fact was fully recognized by the counsel for the United States in the argument in the court below, and that such claim of said Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company was separately argued and considered in said court.

The undersigned are advised that the counsel for the United States and counsel for appellants, making the foregoing motion, have no objection to the foregoing addition or amendment as proposed in this motion.

In all other respects the undersigned unite in the motion made by Reginald Fendall, Tallmadge A. Lambert, Calderon Carlisle and William G. Johnson, as solicitors for certain appellants.

JOHN K. COWEN,
HUGH L. BOND, JR.,
C. F. T. BEALE,

Solicitors for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and John K. Cowen, Joseph Bryan and Hugh L. Bond, Jr., Trustees, Appellants.

No. 292. 49.

FILED,
JAN 10 1898
JAMES H. McKENNEY
CLE

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL.

vs.

THE UNITED STATES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 5, 1898.

To—

Messrs. George E. Hamilton and Nathaniel Wilson, counsel for Martin F. Morris and others, appellants;

John Selden, Esquire, counsel for the Washington Steamboat Company, Limited, and Moncure Robinson and others, appellants;

Messrs. J. K. Cowen, H. L. Bond, Jr., and C. F. T. Beale, counsel for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and Cowen, Bond and Bryan, trustees, appellants;

Joseph J. Darlington, Esquire, counsel for the Independent Ice Company, appellant;

Messrs. Enoch Totten and E. A. Newman, counsel for William W. Rapley, appellant;

William F. Mattingly, Esquire, counsel for Daniel S. Evans, appellant;

Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, counsel for Richard J. Beall, appellant;

Messrs. William A. and J. Holdsworth Gordon and Enoch Totten, counsel for William L. Dunlop and others, heirs of Robert Peter, appellants;

Honorable A. Leo Knott, counsel for Henry M. Marshall and others, heirs of James Marshall, appellants;

Messrs. Mackall and Maedel, counsel for Elizabeth K. Riley, appellant;

James S. Brooke, Esquire, counsel for heirs of Chief Justice Marshall, appellants;
Messrs. Webb, Webb and Lindsley and Lambert and Lambert, counsel for heirs of William Easby, appellants;
Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, counsel for Margaret J. Stone and others, heirs of James Beall, of James, appellants;
Messrs. Webb, Webb and Lindsley and Lambert and Lambert, counsel for heirs of John B. Easby, appellants.

DEAR SIRS:

Upon consideration of the alternative offered by the order of the court, passed herein on the 20th of December, 1897, a copy of which is appended to this communication, we have decided that it would be for the best interest of our clients, and, in our opinion, a great advantage to the orderly presentation of the cause, to have the cause assigned for the second Monday of October term, 1898, with the allowance of twenty-seven hours for oral argument as provided in the court's order, rather than to have the cause heard on the 11th of April, 1898, at this term, with an allowance of only eighteen hours for oral argument.

We are advised that the counsel for the United States, with both of whom we have conferred, will require one-third of the time allowed, whether it be the eighteen hours specified by the court's order for oral argument at this term, or the twenty-seven hours allowed for next term, so that for the appellants the choice is between a period of twelve hours for the oral presentation of all interests and eighteen hours.

If you concur in our request sent with the copy of the order herewith, kindly sign the same and return it to us at your earliest convenience, and in any event before Monday next, the tenth instant.

Respectfully,

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
WILLIAM G. JOHNSON,
Counsel for certain Appellants.

Supreme Court of the United States.

October Term, 1897.

M. F. MORRIS ET AL., Appellants,
vs.
THE UNITED STATES. } No. 292.

On consideration of the motion to postpone the argument of this cause and to fix the time to be allowed and the number of counsel to be heard in oral argument, it is now here ordered by the court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th, 1898, and eighteen hours allowed for the argument, or the case will be assigned for the second Monday of the next term and twenty-seven hours allowed for the argument, the number of counsel and the division of the time allotted to be agreed upon by counsel; if they fail to agree leave is hereby given to apply to the court hereafter to determine the same.

December 20, 1897.

A true copy. Test: JAMES H. MCKENNEY,

[SEAL.] *Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.*

In view of the foregoing order of the court the undersigned counsel for the appellants request that the cause be assigned for the second Monday of the next term.

REGINALD FENDALL,
TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,

Solicitors for the following Appellants:

Wm. G. Johnson, assignee of American Ice Co.; Avarilla Lambert, Martina Carr, heirs of John Van Riswick, deceased; Great Falls Ice Co.; Annie E. Barbour, Harrison S. Barbour, Jas. F. Barbour, Mary V. McCartney, Annie E. Irwin, Annie M. Barbour, Regino Rengifo, and George D. Barbour,

widow and heirs of James L. Barbour; Thomas W. Riley; Mary S. Kimmell Gray, Wm. L. Kimmell, Frank Kimmell, Lester Kimmell, Mary G. Kimmell, Rex Kimmell, Louise M. Kimmell, Eunice Kimmell and Frances E. Kimmell, children, and Gertrude C. Kimmell Wing, widow of Andrew Jackson Kimmell, deceased, heirs of Mary A. S. Kimmell; J. Harrison Johnson and Annie E. Johnson, Charles B. Church and William Wimsatt.

CALDERON CARLISLE,
WM. G. JOHNSON,
Solicitors for E. M. Willis.

We concur in the above request.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1897.

No. 292.

MARTIN F. MORRIS ET AL., APPELLANTS,

vs.

THE UNITED STATES, APPELLEE.

The undersigned, counsel for certain appellants herein, respectfully suggest that it will greatly simplify the presentation and consideration of this cause if this Honorable Court will, before adjourning for the term, fix the order of argument to be observed at the hearing on the 17th of October, 1898.

In view of the extraordinary character of this cause the court has allowed twenty-seven hours for oral argument, and, having left it to counsel to agree upon the number of counsel to be heard and the division of the time allotted, these matters have been provided for by the stipulation and motion this day presented.

By this arrangement the appellants are to have eighteen hours—unless further time shall be granted to the Marshall heirs—and the United States, appellee, is to have nine hours.

It was found expedient in the court below, both in the brief of the United States and in the oral argument of the cause to adopt the natural grouping or division of the claims of the various appellants, which was followed by Mr. Justice Hagner in delivering the opinion of the court (see Vol. 7,

pp. 2474–2475), and it is respectfully submitted that this Honorable Court will greatly facilitate the orderly presentation of the case and subserve its own convenience in the consideration thereof, by adopting the same order.

The claims of all the appellants except those claiming within the lands of Notley Young, are so separate and distinct that they should be first completely presented and finally submitted to the court, both by the appellants and by the United States, as five separate cases, just as they were in the court below.

In the court below the claims of all the defendants, appellants here, within the limits of the lands of the original proprietor, Notley Young, being all the claims between the Long Bridge and the Arsenal Grounds, were, by stipulation, submitted without argument. These claims, fifteen in number, are represented by twelve counsel, and by the stipulation this day filed four of these counsel are to be heard in oral argument, and eight hours have been allotted to them. These claims, while presenting variant features and questions, are so far similar that they can be advantageously presented together. Counsel for the United States can, of course, use so much of the nine hours allotted to the appellee, as they may find necessary or expedient in answering the opening arguments in each division.

It is respectfully submitted that the court should pass an order adopting the following division, and directing the separate argument and submission by both appellants and appellee, in the order named.

I.

The claim made by the heirs of James Marshall and those of his brother, the late Chief Justice John Marshall, to the ownership of the whole bed of the river, from shore to shore, under grants from the crown of England to Lord Culpepper and others, for what is known as the Northern Neck of Virginia, and also under a deed from the present legal

representatives of Henry Harford, the last proprietary of the Province of Maryland.

II.

The claims of ownership to a part of the reclaimed land made by certain defendants who assert title under a patent issued by the United States to John L. Kidwell in the year 1869.

III.

The claims made by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and of Cowen, Bryan and Bond, trustees, to riparian rights from Easby's Point to Seventeenth street.

IV.

The claims of the heirs of William Easby and of John B. Easby, surviving trustee, with reference to certain lots west of the Long Bridge.

V.

The claim to certain ground near the Observatory made by some of the descendants of Robert Peter, an original proprietor of land in the city of Washington.

VI.

The several claims made by the owners of lots in squares facing the river, beginning with Square 233, and extending to the lines of the Arsenal Grounds.

TALLMADGE A. LAMBERT,
CALDERON CARLISLE,
WM. G. JOHNSON.